



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sue after the debt has been paid. *Berthold v. Holman*, 12 Minn. 335; *Corbin v. Reed*, 43 Ia. 459. It is on this ground that the decision in the principal case is to be placed.

**VESTED, CONTINGENT AND FUTURE INTERESTS — IMPLICATION OF TRUST TO PRESERVE CONTINGENT REMAINDER.** — The testator devised property to his widow for life, and after her death to the children of his two sons. Of the two sons of the testator one died childless before the death of the mother, and the other had no children at the time of her death. *Held*, that the court will imply a trust and appoint trustees to preserve the contingent remainder. *Hayward v. Spaulding*, 71 Atl. 219 (N. H.).

A limitation will always be construed as a contingent remainder, if possible, instead of as an executory devise, even if the gift fails on such construction. *White v. Summers*, [1908] 2 Ch. 256. Where a remainder is limited to a person not in being or not yet ascertained, it is contingent. *Hopkins v. Keazer*, 89 Me. 347. And if a contingent remainder does not vest during the continuance of the particular estate or at the instant of its determination, the remainder fails. *Archer's Case*, 1 Co. 66 b. To prevent this the testator must expressly interpose an estate to trustees to preserve the contingent remainder. *Perceval v. Perceval*, L. R. 9 Eq. 386. A different rule seems to prevail in New Hampshire. There the courts will not apply the technical rules of contingent remainders to defeat the intention of the testator, and they will give effect to his intention, unless it is illegal or impossible, regardless of the particular form of words used. *Kennard v. Kennard*, 63 N. H. 303. Thus in the principal case the court implies a direction to trustees to preserve.

**WAR — MILITARY PERSONS AS CONTRABAND OF WAR.** — During the late Russo-Japanese war the plaintiffs reinsured a ship with the defendants and a clause of the policy warranted against "contraband of war." The ship, with two disguised Russian officers on board and bound for a Russian port, was captured and condemned by a Japanese prize court for carrying "contraband persons." The plaintiffs sued on the policy. *Held*, that the plaintiffs may recover. *Yangtze Ins. Ass'n v. Indemnity, etc., Assurance Co.*, 49 L. T. R. 498 (Eng., Ct. App., May 29, 1908).

For a discussion of this case in the lower court, see 21 HARV. L. REV. 636.

**WILLS — CONSTRUCTION — IMPLIED CROSS LIMITATIONS.** — A testator devised his property to trustees to pay the income to his daughters in equal shares, and in case any daughters should die leaving issue, then to such issue. The will further provided that from and after the death of the last surviving daughter and the majority of the testator's youngest grandchild the trustees should pay the *corpus* to the grandchildren in such shares as their mothers would have taken. One daughter died without issue. *Held*, that her share in the income goes to the surviving daughters and not to her representatives. *Macartney v. Macartney*, [1908] Vict. L. Rep. 649.

When there is a bequest to several as tenants in common with a gift over on the death of all, the disposition of the share of one who dies first depends on the construction of the will. Clearly the remainderman is not entitled; for the event on which he is to take — that is, the death of all — has not happened. *Scott v. Bargeman*, 2 P. Wms. 68. Nor should the testator's next of kin take; for a construction resulting in intestacy is to be avoided, even though a different construction results in making the disposition invalid as obnoxious to the rule against perpetuities. *Simpson v. Simpson*, 40 N. Y. L. J. 1203 (N. Y., App. Div., Dec. 1908). If the gift to the co-tenants is for life, the representatives of a deceased tenant cannot take, and hence a cross limitation will be implied. *Neighbour v. Thurlow*, 28 Beav. 33. But if there is an indefinite gift limited only by the gift over, then until the gift over takes effect the representatives of the deceased tenant are entitled. *Bignold v. Giles*, 4 Drewry 343. But this construction may be rebutted, as in the principal case,

if from the whole will it appears that the survivors were intended to take. *Armstrong v. Eldridge*, 3 Bro. Ch. 215.

**WILLS — REVOCATION FOUNDED ON MISTAKE.** — The testatrix destroyed her will on the supposition that she had made another valid will, but which was not, in fact, duly executed. The consent of the next of kin, who were all *sui juris*, having been obtained, application was made for probate of a copy of the destroyed will. *Held*, that the copy is entitled to probate. *Estate of Irvin*, 25 T. L. R. 41 (Eng., Prob. D., Nov. 2, 1908). See NOTES, p. 374.

**WITNESSES — COMPELLING TESTIMONY — VEXATIOUS SERVICE OF SUBPŒNAS UPON MINISTERS OF THE CROWN.** — Subpœnas were served on the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary, who made affidavits that they were unable to give any relevant testimony. The service had been obtained largely for vexatious purposes. *Held*, that the subpœnas should be set aside. *Rex v. Baines*, 25 T. L. R. 79 (Eng., K. B., Nov. 18, 1908). See NOTES, p. 376.

## BOOKS AND PERIODICALS.

### I. LEADING LEGAL ARTICLES.

- BASIS OF LAW, THE.** *John Mahon.* Discussing expediency as the basis of law. 42 Am. L. Rev. 872.
- CANCELLATION OF DEPOSITORY BONDS, THE.** *Luther E. Mackall.* Arguing against the power of surety companies to cancel such bonds. 42 Am. L. Rev. 820.
- CASE FOR LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS, THE.** *Benjamin F. Trueblood.* Showing what advances have been made toward such limitation and pointing out the great expense of maintaining armaments. 2 Am. J. of Int. L. 758.
- CHANGE OF VENUE FOR CONVENIENCE OF WITNESSES — NECESSARY PROOF.** *Anon.* A summary of the law in New York. 15 Bench & Bar 94.
- CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO PARDON CONTEMPTS OF COURT.** *Thomas J. Johnston.* Arguing that the executive never has such power. 12 L. N. (Northport) 185.
- CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A TRIAL BY A JURY OF THE VICINAGE, THE.** *Henry G. Connor.* 57 U. P. L. Rev. 197.
- DATE OF SEPARATION OF ECCLESIASTICAL AND LAY JURISDICTION IN ENGLAND, THE.** *Walter Lichtenstein.* Showing that the separation dates from the time of Stephen. 3 Ill. L. Rev. 347.
- EVOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, THE.** *John W. Foster.* 18 Yale L. J. 149.
- FICTITIOUS PAYEES IN FORGED CHEQUES OR BILLS.** *Louis M. Greeley.* 3 Ill. L. Rev. 331.
- HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONTRACT THEORY IN THE DARTMOUTH COLLEGE CASE.** *R. N. Denham, Jr.* 7 Mich. L. Rev. 201.
- INFLUENCE OF FRENCH LAW IN AMERICA, THE.** *Roscoe Pound.* 3 Ill. L. Rev. 354.
- INQUIRY INTO THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO REGULATE THE INTRA-STATE BUSINESS OF INTERSTATE RAILROADS, AN.** *David W. Fairleigh.* 9 Colum. L. Rev. 38.
- JURISDICTION OF THE ADMIRALTY IN CASES OF TORT.** *Henry Billings Brown.* Containing a history of the development of the law on the question and a statement of the present law. 9 Colum. L. Rev. 1.
- JURISTIC PERSON, THE.** — I, II. *George F. Deiser.* A philosophical treatment of the nature of a corporation. 57 U. P. L. Rev. 131, 216.
- LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE WORK AND THE LAW LIBRARY.** *C. B. Lester.* Emphasizing the need of methods which will make the finding of data on a subject more easy. 41 Chi. Leg. N. 183.
- MAY PROHIBITION LAWS AUTHORIZE THE TAKING OF PROPERTY WITHOUT COMPENSATION?** *O. H. Myrick.* Maintaining that compensation is necessary. 68 Cent. L. J. 2.
- NEW PENAL CODE OF SIAM, THE.** *Tokichi Masao.* 18 Yale L. J. 85.
- NOTICE TO, OR KNOWLEDGE OF, AN AGENT.** *Floyd R. Mechem.* An exhaustive treatment of the subject. 7 Mich. L. Rev. 113.
- OBLIGATORY ARBITRATION AND THE HAGUE CONFERENCES.** *Wm. I. Hull.* Explaining the different forms of arbitration treaties discussed at The Hague Conferences. 2 Am. J. of Int. L. 731.